THE

NATIONAL LEAGUE

FOR THE

PROTECTION

OF THE

FAMILY

Annual Report for 1906

THE

National League for the Protection of the Family.

President.

Hon. SETH LOW, LL.D., New York.

Vice-Presidents.

Rt. Rev. WILLIAM LAWRENCE, D.D., LL.D., Boston.

Prof. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, D.D., Cambridge.

Corresponding Secretary.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

Recording Secretary.

Rev. GEORGE A. JACKSON, Boston.

Treasurer.

WOLCOTT H. JOHNSON, Care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston.

Executive Committee.

Pres. W. E. HUNTINGTON, Ph.D., LL.D., Newton Centre.

Pres. GEORGE HARRIS, D.D., LL.D., Amherst.

Prof. ALBION W. SMALL, Ph.D., LL.D., Chicago.

Rev. DANIEL MERRIMAN, D.D., Worcester.

EVERETT O. FISK, Esq., Boston.

FRANK GAYLORD COOK, Esq., Cambridge.

Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Auburndale.

REPORT

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

FOR THE

Year Ending December 31, 1906

BOSTON:
THE EVERETT PRESS COMPANY, PRINTERS
74 India Street
1907

Notes.

1. Our Reports for 1890, 1892, 1897, 1901, 1903, 1904, and 1905 are the only ones that can now be supplied. That for 1905 is "A Review of Twenty-five Years" and will be sent freely to all who ask for it.

2. The paper read by the Corresponding Secretary before the Congress of Arts and Science in St. Louis on the "Problem of the Family," just printed, will be sent to any who may ask for it. If funds justify the expense other papers may be published during the year.

3. The Census Office is at work collecting the statistics of Marriage and Divorce for the last twenty years to bring the United States Report of 1889 down to date, and we shall, either as a separate paper or in our next Report, publish a summary of its more important results.

4. Every friend of the Family and the Home is urgently invited to give the League a place by the side of other benevolent societies in his annual charities; for money applied to the protection and development of the Home is also in aid of all institutions dependent on good homes. Attention is called to the form of bequest on the third page of the cover; but provision for an immediate endowment is also urged. Contributors who send their gifts early in the year confer a great favor.

5. Associate Annual Membership is offered to all proper persons, both ladies and gentlemen, on payment of five dollars for the year, to be renewed at the pleasure of the subscriber. Such persons are for the time members in full, entitled to all the privileges of the League, including its publications and the right to vote in all our meetings.

6. The Treasurer, Mr. Wolcott H. Johnson, care of C. F. Hovey & Co., Boston, Mass., will acknowledge all contributions. All other correspondence should be addressed to Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., 113 Hancock Street, Auburndale, Mass. Contributions may also be sent to him.

Minutes.

The annual meeting of the National League for the Protection of the Family was held in the Diocesan House, No. 1 Joy Street, Boston, on Friday, Jan. 25, 1907, at 2.30 P.M. The meeting was called to order by Rev. S. W. Dike, LL.D., the Corresponding Secretary. Frank Gaylord Cook, Esq., was chosen to preside, and George P. Dike, Esq., was chosen Temporary Recording Secretary. After prayer offered by the Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., the records of the last annual meeting were read by the Temporary Recording Secretary. Dr. Dike read letters from absent members.

The following persons were elected to membership: E. H. Ellison, George P. Morris, and George P. Dike.

The following officers for the ensuing year were elected:

President, Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., New York.

Vice-Presidents, Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston; Prof. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., Cambridge.

Corresponding Secretary, Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., Auburndale.

Recording Secretary, Rev. George A. Jackson, Boston.

Treasurer, Wolcott H. Johnson, Boston.

Executive Committee, Pres. W. E. Huntington, LL.D., Newton Centre; Pres. George Harris, D.D., LL.D., Amherst; Prof. Albion W. Small, LL.D., Chicago; Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester; Everett O. Fisk, Esq., Boston; Frank Gaylord Cook, Esq., Cambridge; Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL.D., Auburndale.

The annual report of the Treasurer, Mr. Wolcott H. Johnson, was read and approved, and referred to Mr. Cook as Auditor. Dr. Dike read extracts from his annual report as Corresponding Secretary. It was then voted to accept the report, the same to be printed and distributed under the direction of the Corresponding Secretary. Voted to adjourn.

GEORGE P. DIKE,
Temporary Recording Secretary.

Report of Corresponding Secretary.

The year 1906 was marked by the beginning or decided progress in four directions of work for the Family: the beginning of the collection of statistics of marriage and divorce to bring the United States Report of 1889 on the subject down to date; a Congress of the States for the preparation of a Uniform Divorce Bill; the calling of the attention of Congress by the President, in his annual message, to a constitutional amendment on marriage and divorce; and the beginning of a well-devised movement to deal with the evils growing out of social diseases. These and other phases of work for the home are taken up in succeeding parts of this Report.

Marriage and Divorce Statistics.

Last summer the Census Office sent its agents into the largest cities of the country during the vacation of the courts and collected the divorce statistics since 1886, the date to which the Report of 1889 had brought them. At the beginning of 1907 these cities will be visited again, to collect the facts for the remainder of the year 1906, and the force of the office sent into all the other counties of the country, with instructions to do the work for the last twenty years. It is the intention of the office to conduct the investigation on the same lines as those of the former inquiry, and to make the two scientifically comparable with each other. The Census Office fortunately secured the services of President Carroll D. Wright, who conducted the investigation of 1889, to assist in planning the present one. President Wright has conferred with the Secretary of the League with regard to the points of inquiry. While including all the points covered in the earlier investigation, the present one has added several on which it is hoped that some returns may be secured; but in the present state of the libels or petitions for divorce it is very doubtful if any very satisfactory additional matter can be secured. A uniform law providing for the annual collection of statistics, such as has been recommended by the Congress on Uniform Divorce Legislation, is greatly needed.

It is thought that the work can be finished in the coming summer. If practicable, we shall hope to present an outline of its results in our own

next Annual Report and, if our funds justify it, to reprint a digest for general circulation.

With this second report, and the earlier one, we shall have the statistics of this and other countries for a period of forty years, together with an exhibition of the movement of the laws of marriage and divorce, so far as they bear on the subject. It is probable that these two reports will hereafter be followed by similar ones at the interval of twenty or, more likely, ten years, now that the foundations have been laid and the value of the work has become well known, unless the States should all take up the work annually for themselves — a thing most to be desired. At least ten of the States now collect statistics of divorce annually, and about that number report their marriages each year.

As both these investigations originated with the League and were in the main secured and planned very largely in accordance with its suggestions, it and its friends may well congratulate themselves on the results so far, and on the assurance that the work will hereafter go on, whether we have anything to do with it or not.

THE PENNSYLVANIA MOVEMENT FOR UNIFORM DIVORCE LEGISLATION.

We referred briefly last year to the beginnings of a movement under the lead of Pennsylvania for a Uniform Divorce Law. This had the advantage over the plan in connection with the old movement for uniformity, in that this concentrated its effort on divorce alone, while that had so many subjects under consideration that the problem of a Uniform Divorce Law got too little attention.

Some points in the history of this Pennsylvania movement are worth preserving. The Secretary of the League wrote President Roosevelt, in November, 1904, suggesting that in his annual message he call for the bringing of the Marriage and Divorce Report of 1889 down to date, and there is evidence that the President partially planned to do so, but did not carry out the plan. We put in petitions to have Congress make provision for the collection. At the suggestion of Judge Crumpacker, of the Census Committee of the House, the Secretary of the League personally asked the President to send a special message calling for it. This request, by the merest chance made in the presence of the Interchurch Committee on Marriage and Divorce, was instantly granted. In that message the President said, "The hope is entertained that co-operation amongst the several States may be secured, to the end that there may be enacted, upon the subject of marriage and divorce, uniform laws, containing all possible safeguards for the security of the family." This message was dated Jan. 30, 1905. In the Pennsylvania act approved by the Governor March 16, the third "whereas" of the act creating the Commission on Uniformity reads, "*Whereas*, the President of the United States has drawn the attention of Congress to the necessity for

uniformity in the divorce laws of the country, therefore, be it enacted, etc." It is, therefore, apparent that the Pennsylvania movement, if it did not directly originate in the work of our League, did at least draw much support from it. The Secretary, it may be added, was in frequent correspondence with the leaders in that movement, an attendant upon the sessions of its Congress, and much of the time an actual member in addition to being a corresponding member.

The Results of the Congress.

The Congress held its first session in Washington Feb. 19, 1906. Forty States were represented by delegates from a great variety of callings. Jurists of the highest rank, law professors and practical lawyers, distinguished clergymen of various Churches, some educators, and a few women were among the members. Many of the members of the old Commission on Uniformity, who had long studied the subject, were members of this Congress also. Four days were devoted to the discussion of the points to be made the basis of a Uniform Divorce Law. These discussions resulted in seventeen resolutions, covering the ground of a complete Uniform Divorce Law, which were put into the hands of a special committee of experts to be formulated in a Code during the summer. The Congress reassembled, November 13, in Philadelphia, and, after a discussion of the proposed Code for two days, and some amendment of it, adopted it and directed its publication, with an address explaining its provisions. It was issued the last of the year, and has now gone to the Legislatures of the several States for their enactment so far as they see fit.

Some of the Features of the Proposed Act.

The age at which persons may marry is fixed in the provision for annulment of marriage at eighteen and sixteen, unless the parties who have married under those ages confirm the marriage on arrival at those ages. Limited divorce, or divorce *a mensa et thoro*, was unanimously recommended to provide for those who have religious scruples against absolute divorce, and for others. Judicial separation, or the Massachusetts provision for separate maintenance, is but another form of the same thing. In this Code the hopeless insanity of the husband is a ground for a limited divorce, but not the insanity of the wife, as it was recognized that the insanity of the latter might sometimes result from the physical effect of the marriage relation upon the wife.

As to grounds for absolute divorce, the Congress adopted the following resolution: "This Congress, desiring to see the number of causes reduced rather than increased, recommends that no additional causes should be recognized in any State; and in those States where causes are

restricted, no change is called for." The causes in the Code are six in number: adultery, bigamy, conviction of crime in certain cases, extreme cruelty, wilful desertion for two years, and habitual drunkenness for two years. Some of these are carefully qualified, to guard against abuse.

Connivance, collusion, condonation of offence, adultery of the applicant not condoned, are all a bar to divorce. It was also provided that all hearings and trials shall be had in open court, and not before a master, referee, or other delegated representative, and shall in all cases be public.

It is also provided that the records of all cases shall be open to the public. On these two points the address accompanying the bill says: "Objection has been made to these provisions, on the ground of supposed injury to public morals, but after full consideration of the practice prevailing in the different States, the Congress concluded almost unanimously that the advantages of a public and open hearing outweighed any of the dangers suggested, and that in the public interest such hearings were necessary in most of the States in order to prevent a lax administration of the divorce laws." A practical illustration of the statistical difficulty from the present concealment of papers and records has appeared, we learn, in the present investigation, where in one of our large cities a special order from court had to be obtained in each case before it could be reported for statistical purposes. In all uncontested cases, and in any other where the court may deem it necessary or proper, a disinterested attorney may be assigned by the court actively to defend the case. Some of us would have preferred that this last provision be mandatory, or like the provision of a bill introduced in the Legislature of Massachusetts providing for an official whose business it is to investigate and report on every divorce case before it is heard, and then, if desirable, to defend it. A decree *nisi* is to be entered in all cases in the first instance, to become absolute only after the lapse of a year, and then only when no further objection to the divorce has arisen. It will be seen that this provision will act as a deterrent to divorce for the sake of a hasty remarriage to some waiting party.

Migratory Divorces.

Migratory or emigrant divorces, as they are called, received careful attention. The term of residence in the State where the action is brought is made two years, except in cases of adultery or bigamy, "when the cause of action was in such State, and for a like term of residence of one of the parties in the State where action is brought when either has become a resident thereof since the cause of action arose, with the important proviso in the latter case that the cause of action must have been recognized in the State in which such party resided at the time the cause

of action arose, as a ground for the same relief asked for in the action." This is in substance the Delaware law of the last fifteen years, which was made to shut New York people out of the courts of Delaware, and which the League has presented from time to time ever since.

The migration for evasion of the laws of one's own State is checked by another provision, it being now a law of Massachusetts, which was sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States. It provides, "That if any inhabitant of this State shall go into another State, Territory, or country to obtain a decree of divorce for a cause which occurred while the parties resided in this State, a decree so obtained shall have no force or effect in this State."

When these and various other carefully drawn provisions relating to jurisdiction are complied with, the law then directs that full faith and credit shall be given in all the courts of a State to the decrees of annulment and divorce by all courts of competent jurisdiction in all the other States and Territories. This last point received the most careful consideration after the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States early in the year in the celebrated *Haddock* case. The Congress thought it best to leave the minor details of procedure to the States to arrange for themselves.

The Best Practicable Law.

The address accompanying the proposed law says of it: "It is fully realized that the law now proposed is not a complete or ideal uniform divorce law, but that it is only the best law in that direction which it now seems practicable to obtain. . . . The substantial unanimity with which the resolutions and the act have been adopted by the Congress encourages the hope that the provisions of the Uniform Divorce Law, substantially in the form now submitted, may ultimately be approved by the Congress of the United States, and all of the States and Territories, or by so many of them as to secure a decided advance in the direction of a reformation of the American laws relating to marriage and divorce." Of course its adoption will at first be slow. We may have to wait a year or two for its adoption anywhere. But let us hope that some States will lead off this year.

The Limitations of Legal Reform.

The address of the Divorce Congress so admirably expresses what has always been urged in our Reports from time to time that we quote it here:

"In the control of divorce and its attendant evils, laws perform an important, but only a subordinate, part. The practical remedy for controlling the evil is the elevation of the general moral standard in all our

communities, not only as to the sundering of the tie intended to be life-long and indissoluble, but also as to marriage itself, and the assumption of its obligations.

"For this supreme work there must be enlisted the personal interest and influence of all American men and women who cherish the sanctity of marriage and would preserve the stability and happiness of the home; and their support must be given to the forces and influences which control society and mould public opinion — the fountain and source of our laws. To all who in official station or in the church, on the platform, or through the public press, share in forming an enlightened public opinion on a question of vital interest to the American nation, we confidently appeal for aid and coöperation in this first formal effort toward the settlement, by the States themselves, in the form of law, of some of the questions pressing for solution."

President Roosevelt on Problems of the Family.

The annual message of the President, apparently written before the Philadelphia session of the Divorce Congress, besides repeating his well-known utterances on race suicide through the wilful sterility of the married, recommends a constitutional amendment to give Congress power to deal with marriage, divorce, and polygamy. Whether this call for a constitutional amendment was made through an apparent change of opinion or in forgetfulness of the plan of State coöperation is not clear. Besides the impression it will give of the gravity of the divorce question, this utterance at this time will compel attention to the two methods of securing uniformity and in the end serve to clear public opinion. The League, in its Reports, many years ago pointed out the difficulties in the way of uniformity through constitutional amendment and urged a fair and full trial of the plan of State coöperation. Its Secretary at least has not yet seen any good reason for the abandonment of the present plan until the States generally refuse to come into it.

Social Diseases and the Birth-rate.

Our former Reports have often spoken of the danger from the low birth-rate among our so-called native population, but more especially from the sterility of those best fitted to rear a reasonable number of children. The subject is now taking on a new aspect, to which the attention of those outside the medical profession should be called.

Since the discovery of the germ of what was formerly considered the milder and less harmful of the two chief sexual diseases, and more especially since the numerous ramifications and effects of this milder form, hitherto little suspected to exist, have been found and studied, there has been a strong tendency towards agreement among medical author-

ities that this disease is the real cause of a large part of the decline in the birth-rate everywhere. While the difficulty of getting accurate statistics on the subject is fully recognized by the authorities upon it, they seem to agree that nearly or quite one half of the cases of sterility among the married are due to this milder of the two diseases, and some would put it much higher. The more recent investigations also go to show, so the medical authorities say, that a large number of what they call "one-child marriages" must be accounted for by the effects of this milder of the two diseases. It may be that these figures are based too much on European conditions and those of our great cities. But after all needed allowance for these defects, there still remains a grave state of things. There are other alarming statistics given in this connection by the specialists, but they need not be repeated here. It is sufficient to point to the peril to innocent women and children and to society from diseases that physicians say are more full of danger than tuberculosis, but whose nature is often carefully concealed from their innocent victims.

The recent publication of Dr. Prince A. Morrow's scientific book on "Social Diseases and Marriage," the taking up of the subject last summer by the American Medical Association, the formation of the Society for Sanitary and Moral Prophylaxis in New York, with Dr. Morrow as president, and of the Pennsylvania Society for the Prevention of Social Disease, with Dr. Henry N. Willson, Jr., of Philadelphia, as secretary, and the action of the last Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts in appointing a special committee to investigate and report on the subject are hopeful signs that a most difficult and delicate subject of the greatest importance is receiving the attention of capable and efficient leaders.

It is thought that many divorces are due to some form of the social disease, though of course this cause rarely appears in the legal proceedings. But however wide of the mark opinions and available statistics may be, it is clear that enough is true to call for the most careful attention. The Pennsylvania society aims to reach every adult man in the State with its literature prepared by eminent physicians and educators. It is to be hoped that the movement everywhere will be in the control of only the wisest and most intelligent people.

The Home Department of the Sunday School.

This offspring of the League is apparently growing faster in numbers and in favor than ever before. What are said to be conservative statistics put the number of Home Departments in North America in 1906 at 11,891, with 438,102 members. Massachusetts probably takes the lead, with some ten or eleven per cent as many persons in the Home Departments as in the entire Sunday-school membership. Yet not half the

schools of the State have adopted the plan. The Home Department is saving the Sunday schools of the country from a serious decline in membership. It is proving itself a most efficient aid of the churches in reaching those outside its public assemblies, and steadily recruiting the membership both of the Sunday school and the Church itself. But, best of all, it is showing the thoughtful that the home is not only capable of great usefulness in Bible study and in pastoral work, but that it may yet be used in other ways to do work that is left undone or else turned over to other institutions. When once the inventive mind of our earnest Christian workers is fairly turned to the subject, we may expect to see a far closer coöperation between the Home, the Church, and the School than we have yet had — and this to the great increase of educational and religious efficiency.

During the year the Congregational Sunday School and Publishing Society has published its long-delayed acknowledgment of the error of the claims of its book on the Home Department regarding the origin of this institution and ordered a new edition more in accord with the facts as it now sees them to be. But while appreciating this act of justice, one cannot help feeling that it is due the churches which this society serves, and the Sunday-school public at large, which has been misled by its conduct, that the means by which an erroneous claim has been allowed to get and hold a dominating place in the entire Sunday-school world should be made known. The mere restoration of rights in a just claim is of slight importance compared with the detection of the means, whether of innocent intention or of deliberate deception, by which these rights have been violated. So far the society in question has refused to act on this more important matter.

The Home in Church and School.

There is growth of the feeling that the Home has a larger place in the work of both Church and School than it has yet been given. Three gentlemen of the highest standing in connection with the educational interests of Massachusetts have said recently in private conversation that in their opinion the problem of the place of the home in relation to education is nearly if not quite the most important of the proximate problems of the public-school system. Our Reports in former years have repeatedly pointed to the same idea in substance. Indeed, the immediate motive leading to the invention of the Home Department of the Sunday school was to show the practicability of using the Home for work which the Church and its School were not doing because attention was concentrated on the collection of individuals in congregations, schools, and the like in the hope that the practical principle used in the Home Department would be so recognized that other devices for using

the home would follow. The capture of the Home Department by those interested chiefly in use of school and classes for a long time obscured the original principle and central purpose of the Home Department; but in time we shall get back to the potent underlying idea of finding and using the sound principle of social proportion that requires that Church, School, and Home do their work in the fullest understanding of the respective possibilities of each, and with adequate provision for each.

With others of a special committee your Secretary is at work on a report to be made late in the coming year to the National Council of Congregational Churches on this subject. Unfortunately, so wide a scope of subjects is assigned to the committee that but little space can be given to this particular point. One sometimes thinks that if such a body as the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church would consent to give half the time it has sometimes devoted to the discussion of the divorce question, with small results, to a consideration of the subject of the Home in the work of the Church, great good would follow. That Church and the Lutheran Churches are apparently in exceptionally fine positions to lead in the effort to get a larger place for the home in religious life.

Social Education.

The Religious Education Association has in the last two or three years done considerable to direct attention to the home as a factor in the education of the people; and now in the last year a Congress has been held on Social Education which has also treated the subject. Social education is of course the most comprehensive of educational conceptions, and marks the advance of thought in the educational world. It is important for us in that the place of the home in the field comes into prominence. One entire session with four addresses was given in this Congress to the home and its relation to the school. It is to be hoped that women's clubs, parents' associations, and similar bodies wiil give increasing attention to the home. The convocations, conferences, and conventions of the churches may well give the home a more frequent place in their discussions than it has been getting. After two or three generations, if not centuries, of neglect, the home may well receive special attention. It is in the constructive work that can be done for the home, far more than in its mere direct protection by law, that the safety, as well as the future power, of the home lies.

Publications.

While writing this Report the seventh volume of the Proceedings of the Congress of Arts and Sciences held in connection with the St. Louis Exposition has been issued. It is devoted to the social sciences, and contains two papers on the Family. One of these is on "Social Control and

the Function of the Family," by Professor George E. Howard, of the University of Nebraska, and the other is by the Corresponding Secretary of the League, on "The Problem of the Family." The latter is reprinted by the League, and can be sent to any who may desire to see it. Perhaps an arrangement may be made for the reissue of Professor Howard's valuable and suggestive discussion from another point of view. The entire volume is of great importance to all interested in various phases of the social problem. The series of eight volumes is published by Houghton, Mifflin and Company, Boston.

"Social Diseases and Marriage" is the title of a book, already referred to, by Dr. Prince A. Morrow, Emeritus Professor in the University and Bellevue Hospital Medical College, New York. It is published by Lea Brothers and Company, New York and Philadelphia.

The Uniform Divorce Bill and accompanying address can probably be had on application to Hon. W. D. Crocker, Williamsport, Penn. Verbatim copies of the proceedings of the Washington session of the Divorce Congress were printed and should be found in all State Libraries, and in many others. We have not learned whether a verbatim report of the last session is also to be issued.

Copies of the last of our Annual Reports, which is a survey of the field and work for the twenty-five years of our organization, can be sent to all who desire. Write for the "Review of Twenty-five Years."

Financial.

As will be seen in the report of the Treasurer on another page, our receipts very nearly met our expenses, which were kept down to an extremely low amount and much below the sum needed for the best efficiency. The needs of San Francisco, the special efforts of some of the missionary societies to increase their own collections, and an unusual number of deaths among our larger contributors, in the last year or two, together with the constant pressure of the old and well-established benevolent societies, with the calls of many new ones, have made the work of collection for the League a difficult one.

We greatly need an increase in the number of those who contribute money in support of our work. Surely the only society in the country devoted to the protection and development of the Home should have an ample support for its own sake, and for the sake of every other interest that depends on the home life of our people.

Early and unsolicited contributions are especially welcome. About forty per cent of the receipts of the year were collected after December 1. This delay is embarrassing. We call attention to what we said last year about an endowment. What better use, we repeat, can be made of $100,000 than for the endowment of this or some other society,

if such would be better, that should forever be devoted to the protection and improvement of the Home in our country? But let every one who values the home set aside something each year for the League.

The Death of Our President.

In the death of the Hon. Nathaniel Shipman the League has lost an officer, supporter, and friend of the greatest value. Judge Shipman was one of our early members and officers, and was President eight years, a longer term than any one else served. Though unable to attend our meetings, his hearty interest, frequent counsel, remarkably sound judgment, and generous aid in several ways made his service one of the greatest value.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL W. DIKE,
Corresponding Secretary.

Treasurer's Report.

Receipts		$2,166 95
Expenditures		
Advertising, etc.	$14 29	
Postage	48 75	
Printing	128 15	
Stationery	4 90	
Rent	50 00	
Travelling	163 81	
		409 90
		$1,757 05
Salary of S. W. Dike	$1,800 00	
Deficit for year ending Dec. 31, 1906		$42 95

Wolcott H. Johnson, *Treasurer.*

Jan. 25, 1907.

I have this day examined the foregoing accounts of the Treasurer, with vouchers for the same, and find them to be correct.

(Signed) Frank Gaylord Cook, *Auditor.*

Contributions.

Jan.	2.	Hon. Seth Low, LL.D., New York, N. Y.	$50 00	
	9.	Mrs. William E. Dodge, New York, N. Y.	100 00	
	10.	"A Vermont Lady"	50 00	
	10.	Rev. David H. Tribou, Philadelphia, Penn	1 00	
	11.	Rev. Claudius B. Spencer, D.D., Kansas City, Mo	5 00	
	11.	Frank Gaylord Cook, Cambridge	2 00	
	27.	Rev. Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr., New Haven, Conn.	5 00	
		Received in January		$213 00
Feb.	1.	Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL.D., Hartford, Conn.	$25 00	
	6.	State Street Congregational Church, Portland, Me.	15 00	
	7.	Miss M. Josephine Allen, Boston	5 00	
	13.	Mrs. George H. Corliss, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	13.	Rev. Charles F. Dole, Jamaica Plain	5 00	
	13.	Rev. Thomas W. Thompson, Worcester	5 00	
	14.	Mrs. Charlotte F. Blackman, Waterbury, Conn.	10 00	
	14.	Rev. C. B. Moody, Bristol, Conn.	5 00	

Feb.	15.	Professor Edward Y. Hincks, D.D., Andover	$5 00	
	15.	James C. Braman, Auburndale	10 00	
	15.	Hon. James Schouler, LL.D., Boston	5 00	
	19.	Rt. Rev. John Scarborough, D.D., LL.D., Trenton, N.J.	10 00	
	19.	Prof. Henry W. Farnam, R.P.D., New Haven, Conn.	10 00	
	19.	Robert C. Ogden, New York, N. Y.	25 00	
	19.	Rt. Rev. William Crosswell Doane, D.D., LL.D., Albany, N. Y.	5 00	
	20.	Mrs. John S. Mitchell, Waterbury, Conn.	50 00	
	20.	Rt. Rev. Chauncey B. Brewster, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	3 00	
	20.	Rt. Rev. Daniel S. Tuttle, D.D., LL.D., St. Louis, Mo.	5 00	
	20.	Hon. Arthur T. Lyman, Boston	5 00	
	20.	Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Boston	25 00	
	20.	Rev. W. P. Alcott, Boxford	2 00	
	26.	St. Agnes' Chapel, New York, N. Y.	10 00	
	26.	President Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D., Washington, D. C.	10 00	
		Received in February		$260 00
Mar.	1.	Rev. F. N. Peloubet, D.D., Auburndale	$10 00	
	1.	Rev. Joshua Coit, Winchester	2 00	
	8.	Morris K. Jesup, New York, N. Y.	10 00	
	10.	Hon. Moses Giddings, Bangor, Me.	5 00	
	10.	Rev. David Howard Tribou, Philadelphia, Penn. (Additional)	1 00	
	10.	Mrs. William G. Benedict, Boston	10 00	
	10.	Rt. Rev. Alexander H. Vinton, D.D., Springfield	5 00	
	10.	Rev. E. Blakeslee, D.D., Brookline	3 00	
	12.	Rt. Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., LL.D., Burlington, Vt.	5 00	
	12.	Rev. George B. Johnson, Burlington, Vt.	5 00	
	12.	Old South Church, Boston	25 00	
	12.	Rev. W. Spooner Smith, Worcester	5 00	
	14.	Rev. W. H. Cobb, D.D., Newton Center	5 00	
	17.	Alfred T. White, Brooklyn, N. Y.	20 00	
	26.	Prof. Walter F. Willcox, Ithaca, N. Y.	5 00	
	27.	Christ Church, Hartford, Conn.	10 00	
	28.	Women's Missionary Society, St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.	5 00	
	28.	Hon. W. O. Hart, New Orleans, La.	5 00	
	30.	Rev. S. P. Leeds, D.D., Hanover, N. H.	2 00	
		Received in March		$138 00
Apr.	4.	Miss Martha C. Burgess, Dedham	$5 00	
	14.	Dr. W. W. Keen, Philadelphia, Penn.	5 00	
	17.	Stuart Wood, Philadelphia, Penn.	15 00	
	19.	Rt. Rev. W. H. Hare, D.D., Sioux City, S. D.	5 00	
	24.	George Burnham, Sr., Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
		Received in April		$55 00

May	3.	Hon. James Tillinghast, Providence, R. I.	$10 00	
	3.	Rathbone Gardner, Providence, R. I.	5 00	
	3.	Rt. Rev. W. N. McVickar, D.D., Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	3.	Charles Morris Smith, Providence, R. I.	10 00	
	3.	Grace Church, New York, N. Y.	20 00	
	10.	Rev. Walker Gwynne, Summit, N. J.	2 00	
	18.	Rev. Francis Goodwin, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	20 00	
	28.	Prof. Lewis O. Brastow, D.D., New Haven, Conn.	5 00	
		Received in May		$82 00
June	4.	Mrs. John S. Porter, Hartford, Conn.	$25 00	
	20.	George Ripley, Andover	10 00	
	20.	Miss Alice Byington, Stockbridge	5 00	
	23.	Hon. Samuel B. Capen, Boston	10 00	
	30.	Samuel V. Hoffman, New York, N. Y.	25 00	
		Received in June		$75 00
July	3.	Rev. Cornelius H. Patton, D.D., Boston	$5 00	
	5.	"For the Home," Connecticut	6 00	
	6.	Mrs. Charles P. Turner, Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
	19.	St. John's Parish, Stamford, Conn.	25 12	
	22.	Congregational Church, Windham, Conn.	11 33	
	26.	Mrs. Richard H. Dana, Cambridge	5 00	
		Received in July		$77 45
Aug.	9.	J. D. R. Lamson, Toledo, O.	$10 00	
	9.	Rev. Arthur Lawrence, D.D., Stockbridge	25 00	
		Received in August		$35 00
Sept.	6.	Dr. William C. Rives, Washington, D. C.	$5 00	
	7.	First Baptist Church, Newton Center	25 00	
	24.	W. J. Breed, Cincinnati, O.	5 00	
	24.	Ginn & Company, Boston	10 00	
	26.	Daniel C. Gilman, Baltimore, Md.	5 00	
		Received in September		$50 00
Oct.	3.	Rev. A. St. John Chambre, D.D., Lowell	$20 00	
	4.	Rev. A. B. Hunter, Raleigh, N. C.	5 00	
	8.	Mrs. Wallace H. Camp, Waterbury, Conn.	50 00	
	8.	Rev. John G. Davenport, D.D., Waterbury, Conn.	10 00	
	19.	Rev. John H. Denison, D.D., Williamstown	10 00	
	23.	Miss Lucy Burr, Auburndale	25 00	
	27.	Hon. J. P. Bates, Brookline	10 00	
	27.	William B. Taylor, Lynn	5 00	
		Received in October		$135 00
Nov.	1.	Rev. Lewellyn Pratt, D.D., Norwich, Conn.	$5 00	
	3.	Hon. Edward L. Pickard, Auburndale	20 00	
	3.	Mrs. Gilman C. Hill, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00	
	6.	St. Stephen's Church, Pittsfield	10 00	
	12.	Prof. Charles R. Henderson, D.D., Chicago, Ill.	5 00	

Nov.	13.	George Burnham, Jr., Philadelphia, Penn.	$25 00	
	13.	Rt. Rev. Alexander Mackay-Smith, D.D., Philadelphia, Penn.	15 00	
	15.	E. P. Dutton, New York, N. Y.	5 00	
	15.	Gen. William A. Aiken, Norwich, Conn.	5 00	
	15.	Hon. Frederick J. Kingsbury, LL.D., Waterbury Conn.	25 00	
	20.	Rt. Rev. E. M. Parker, D.D., Concord, N. H.	5 00	
	22.	St. Stephen's Church, Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
	24.	William P. Henszey, Philadelphia, Penn.	25 00	
	28.	Park Congregational Church, Norwich, Conn.	15 00	
	29.	Mrs. John S. Brigham, Worcester	5 00	
	29.	Mrs. David P. Kimball, Boston	25 00	
	29.	Rev. Samuel C. Bushnell, Arlington	5 00	
	30.	Arthur C. Farley, Auburndale	5 00	
		Received in November		$227 00

Dec.	3.	Hon. Robert H. Gardiner, Boston	$5 00	
	3.	Prof. William North Rice, LL.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
	3.	Hon. Francis Lynde Stetson, LL.D., New York, N. Y.	30 00	
	3.	Arthur S. Johnson, Boston	10 00	
	4.	Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.	50 00	
	4.	Hon. William B. Plunkett, Adams	10 00	
	5.	Rev. Horace Dutton, Auburndale	5 00	
	5.	President William J. Tucker, D.D., LL.D., Hanover, N. H.	10 00	
	6.	Wolcott H. Johnson, Boston	25 00	
	6.	Trinity Church, Boston	25 00	
	6.	Rev. James W. Bixler, D.D., New London, Conn.	10 00	
	6.	Hon. John E. Parsons, New York, N. Y.	25 00	
	7.	Walter C. Brooks, Newton Center	5 00	
	8.	W. W. Lockwood, New York, N. Y.	5 00	
	8.	Prof. Austin B. Bassett, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	5 00	
	8.	Hon. Robert Treat Paine, Boston	5 00	
	11.	Rev. A. W. Hazen, D.D., Middletown, Conn.	5 00	
	11.	A. C. Tenney, Melrose	1 00	
	11.	William B. Herrick, Auburndale	10 00	
	11.	W. A. Macleod, Dorchester	5 00	
	12.	Miss M. R. Hicks, Fall River	2 00	
	12.	C. V. S. Remington, Fall River	5 00	
	12.	Jerome C. Borden, Fall River	5 00	
	13.	Everett O. Fisk, Auburndale	5 00	
	15.	Rev. James L. Barton, D.D., Newton Center	5 00	
	15.	Prof. Williston Walker, D.D., New Haven, Conn.	5 00	
	17.	Grace Church, Providence, R. I.	25 00	
	17.	Rev. John P. Taylor, D.D., Andover	5 00	
	17.	First Church, Newton Center	10 00	
	17.	Rev. W. H. Cobb, D.D., Newton Center (Extra)	5 00	

Dec.	17.	First Congregational Church, Manchester, N. H.	$5 00
	17.	Arthur Reed Kimball, Waterbury, Conn.	5 00
	18.	St. Stephen's Church, Providence, R. I.	10 00
	19.	President G. Stanley Hall, LL.D., Worcester	5 00
	20.	Rev. Frederick B. Allen, Boston	5 00
	20.	W. P. Blake, Boston	5 00
	20.	Church of the Ascension, New York, N. Y.	25 00
	21.	Rev. Allen W. Cooke, Cambridge	2 50
	21.	Miss Edith Woolsey, New Haven, Conn.	5 00
	21.	Prof. Waldo S. Pratt, Hartford, Conn.	3 00
	21.	Prof. Edwin K. Mitchell, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	5 00
	22.	Arthur L. Shipman, Hartford, Conn.	25 00
	22.	Trinity Church, Hartford, Conn.	5 00
	22.	Miss M. Josephine Allen, Boston	5 00
	24.	Rev. E. E. Strong, D.D., Auburndale	3 00
	25.	Prof. Theodore S. Woolsey, New Haven, Conn.	15 00
	26.	"Friends," Thompson, Conn.	10 00
	26.	"A friend," Boston	15 00
	26.	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D.D., Worcester	10 00
	26.	First Church, Exeter, N. H.	5 00
	27.	St. John's Church, Providence, R. I.	20 00
	28.	Rt. Rev. Frederick Burgess, D.D., Garden City, N. Y.	5 00
	29.	R. H. Stearns, Boston	10 00
	31.	Mrs. Coolidge S. Roberts, Cambridge	20 00
	31.	Prof. Melancthon W. Jacobus, D.D., Hartford, Conn.	25 00
	31.	James Logan, Worcester	10 00
	31.	Rev. Charles G. Ames, Boston	5 00
	31.	New Hampshire Church Settlement Association	5 00
	31.	Rt. Rev. Leighton Coleman, D.D., LL.D., Wilmington, Del.	3 00
	31.	R. S. Douglass, Brookline	5 00
	31.	President W. H. P. Faunce, D.D., LL.D., Providence, R. I.	10 00
	31.	Rev. Morgan Dix, D.D., LL.D., New York, N. Y.	10 00
	31.	Rev. Samuel W. Dike, Auburndale	25 00
	31.	President Henry Hopkins, D.D., LL.D., Williamstown	5 00
	31.	George P. Dike, Auburndale	5 00
	31.	Union Church, Providence, R. I.	10 00
	31.	Hon. Elbridge Torrey, Boston	10 00
	31.	Miss Grace Dodge, New York, N. Y.	100 00
	31.	Hon. Arthur H. Wellman, Malden	5 00
	31.	G. Henry Whitcomb, Worcester	25 00
	31.	Mrs. R. H. Dana, Cambridge	5 00
	31.	Joseph Smith, Andover	10 00
		Received in December	$819 50

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

National League for the Protection of the Family

ARTICLE I. This association shall be called the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY.

ART. II. The object of shall be, through the improvement of public sentiment and legislation, to protect the institution of the Family, especially as affected by existing evils existing in Marriage and Divorce, and to secure its proper efficiency in individual and social life. It may co-operate with auxiliary or other leagues having similar aims in such ways as may be deemed expedient.

ART. III. It shall consist of the following persons, having power to fill vacancies and to add to their number:

ART. IV. The officers of this society shall be a President, not more than five Vice-Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee of not more than twelve persons, of which committee the Corresponding Secretary shall be a member, and of which not less than three shall constitute a quorum, having the power to fill vacancies in their several offices, to be elected at the Annual Meeting, and to hold office until their successors are appointed.

ART. V. The Executive shall hold its Annual Meeting on the third Wednesday in January, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman of the Executive Committee, and at such time and place as shall be indicated in the call of the committee.

ART. VI. Amendments of this Constitution, of which due notice shall have been given in the call of one Annual Meeting, may be adopted at such meeting by the vote of two-thirds of the members present.

All communications concerning the work of the League and its general business should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, Rev. SAMUEL W. DIKE, LL.D., Andover, Mass.

Subscriptions should be sent to the Treasurer, Mr. WOLCOTT H. JOHNSON, care of C. J. Tower & Co., Boston.

FORM OF BEQUEST

I hereby give and bequeath to the NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE FAMILY, a corporation created by the Laws of the State of Connecticut, or its successors, the sum of _____ dollars, the principal [or income, as the case may be] of which is to be used for the purposes for which said Corporation was organized.